

REMARKS:

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 3, 4, 12, 14, 16, 20 and 22-25. Claims 3, 12, 14, 16, 20 and 22-25 are amended herein, new claim 26 is added and Claims 1, 2, 5-11, 13, 15, 17-19 and 21 remain cancelled. No new matter is presented.

Thus, claims 3, 4, 12, 14, 16, 20 and 22-26 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b):

Claims 3, 16, 20 and 22-25 are being rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,708,798 (Lynch).

Lynch configures systems based on component requests that are made using input forms with listboxes and pushbuttons to specify types and quantities of components to be configured (see, column 26, lines 1-8). In Lynch, the requests are input in the form of requests (i.e., components or resources) or needs, such as an expression of a need for a desktop computer to be used in a CAD environment (see, Abstract and col. 5, lines 40-50). That is, a customer using the Lynch system needs to specify a needed component for a system configuration using an interface that requires entry in terms of a component and/or entry of use of the component.

The present invention displays objects of use of different commodities that are available for sale. Then, the user selects from the displayed objects of use, thereby eliminating the need for the user to specify a need associated with a commodity or the commodity information.

Independent claims 3, 16 and 20 as amended recite, "displaying objects of use of commodities" and "preparing a table indicative of correspondence between the objects of use and specifications required to attain the commodities". When a user selects "the at least one object of use from the displayed objects of use of commodities", the present invention acquires "a specification corresponding to the at least one object of use" selected (claims 3, 16 and 20).

Similarly, independent claim 22 as amended recites, "preparing a table indicative of correspondence between objects of use of the commodities and specifications required to attain the commodities" and "acquiring a specification corresponding to at least one object of use" when the user selects "at least one object of use from the displayed objects of use of commodities".

Independent claims 23 and 24 respectively recite that commodity specification is

retrieved based on “the user selecting at least one usage information from the displayed selectable commodities usage information” (claim 23) and “a selection of at least one selectable commodities usage information” (claim 24).

Independent claim 25 recites, “automatically displaying a specification information of the commodity” based on “a selection of usage information by a user from commodities usage information displayed to the user”.

Each or independent claims 3, 16, 20 and 22-25 further recite that the specification of the commodity is retrieved and displayed to the user “without requiring the user’s knowledge of specifications corresponding to the at least one object of use selected by the user”.

Lynch does require a user to specify a needed component for a system configuration does not teach or suggest the features of independent claims 3, 16, 20 and 22-25.

It is submitted that the independent claims are patentable over Lynch.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over Lynch. The dependent claims are also independently patentable. For example, as recited in claim 4, “a specification corresponding to the at least one object of use” selected by the user is retrieved via a network where “the network is Internet”. The Lynch does not teach or suggest these features of claim 4 and independent claim 3, upon which claim 4 depends.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

Claims 4, 12 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lynch and U.S. Patent No. 6,167,383 (Henson).

Henson is directed to allowing a selection to be made from *components* from a display of available system options for a chosen system using an online store (see, column 2, lines 5-9). In Henson, a system configuration options screen (70) is provided to a customer of the online store to allow the customer to configure a machine by selecting from options listed on the configuration screen (see, col. 3, lines 18-30 and FIGS. 3A-3C).

Independent claims 12 and 14 recite that “objects of use of commodities” are displayed to the user, using which the user selects “at least one object of use of the commodities”, thereby providing information of a commodity having specifications corresponding to the selected object of use “without requiring the user’s knowledge of specifications corresponding to the at least one

object of use selected by the user”.

The combination of Lynch and Henson does not teach or suggest displaying “objects of use of commodities” to allow a user to select “at least one object of use of the commodities” and provide a commodity specification “ without requiring the user’s knowledge of specifications corresponding to the at least one object of use selected by the user”, as recited in claims 12 and 14.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIM:

New claim 26 emphasizes that the present invention includes enabling a user “to make a selection from the displayed object of use for each of the commodities for sale” for “providing information of a corresponding commodity to the user based on the selection of the object of use” (i.e., a user simply clicks on object of use without specifying an intended use of a commodity or intended use thereof).

The cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest that above-discussed features of claim 26.

Therefore, new claim 26 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 10/4/05
1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

By: 
J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358